

# Oregon Daily EMERALD

The OREGON DAILY EMERALD published Monday through Friday during the college year except Oct. 30; Dec. 5 through Jan. 3; Mar. 6 through 28; May 7; Nov. 22 through 27; and after May 24, with issues on Nov. 4 and May 12, by the Associated Students of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the postoffice, Eugene, Oregon. Subscription rates: \$5 per school year; \$2 per term.

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of the writer and do not pretend to represent the opinions of the ASUC or of the University. Initialed editorials are written by the associate editors. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor.

**ANITA HOLMES, Editor**  
**MARTEL SCROGGIN, Business Manager**  
**LORNA LARSON, Managing Editor**  
**TOM KING, KEN METZLER, JACKIE PRITZEN, Associate Editors**  
**SHIRLEY HILLARD, Advertising Manager**

## EQUALITY IN DEFERMENTS

"I'm a college man. My grades are pretty high, or I can pass an aptitude test. So I don't have to go into the army."

That is the status of the college man several days after President Truman passed an executive order allowing draft deferments to students with high grades or ability to pass an aptitude test.

This special privilege for the intellectuals or "bright boys" as Gerald Johnson put it in last month's Harper's, smacks of unfairness to one reared in the American system.

Our immediate reaction is like that of the student who told the Inquiring Reporter, "I don't think those guys should be more exempt than any others just because they have more brainpower."

But this question which the military and governmental heads have been puzzling over for months is not so easily answered. Let's look at both sides, and then re-evaluate.

Taking a long-range view, America will continue to need professional men, specialized leaders to direct the country. We cannot afford to become a country of militarists, forgetting the life of a world without war.

Granted we have to look ahead. But is a high grade or a high test score the mark of a man worth preserving for his non-military contribution to our society? It's not difficult to name a series of "skunks," all of them with high intellect, but none of them assets to the society in which they live.

This order by the President creates an intellectual elite. It elevates the scholar above the so-called masses, a practice we do not advocate in America.

**China Students Were Floundering**  
A reading of "Peking Diary" makes one extremely fearful of an intellectual aristocracy. Bodde tells in that recent book how the students made up an upper strata in China. When Mao and the Communists moved into North China cities such as Peking, the students floundered, not fitting into any part of the society. The conditions under which they let themselves live were tragic.

Then there is the financial standpoint. Just because a man is financially able to go to college, should he receive more privileges than the other man whose lack of money, not intelligence, holds him out?

No, but it is becoming increasingly easier to work your way through college if you have the will. The bright student has the chance for loans and scholarships to help make his way.

So we'll rule out the money angle and say that small percentage of men wanting to go to school, but lacking the money, must be sacrificed for the long-range national good.

**Postponement, Not Exemption**  
A more important answer to the entire question is that college men are not being exempted. They are just being deferred under the new measure. Universal military training will still be universal, but one segment of the public will be allowed to delay its training period for three or four years.

The greatest unfairness is here. Why should these men with more A's than C's or more know-how with aptitude tests be allowed to postpone their training while the others aren't.

In wartime, it would be a gross injustice to defer college intellectuals ahead of anyone else. In peacetime, it's the country's responsibility to give equal opportunity. If college men are allowed to take their training almost when they choose, so should non-college men be allowed to serve the months they choose within a four, five, or six year period after reaching draft age.

If we truly are planning a peacetime army, this leeway for individual decision should go to all men of all intellects and aptitudes. If we are preparing for war, we're all in it, and as Johnson wrote, "he who would separate himself from his fellows now should and shall be cast out from them forever."

**THE DAILY 'E'...**  
to Barbara Stevenson, Bonnie Gienger, and Beverly Robathan who are now serving their last day as presidents of the Associated Women Students, Women's Recreation Association, and YWCA respectively. These three leaders officially give up their positions tonight at installation ceremonies.



### The Word

## Columnist Cracks Whip at Columnist; Says Initials Might Mean 'Jackass'

From Stan Turnbull

Every spring the lucky University of Oregon students get a choice of two spring football practices to watch. They may trudge down to the lower athletic fields and watch the outdoor athletes, or peruse the Emerald editorial page, where the indoor athletes kick around what for the past couple of years has been the Emerald's pet football—the Greek party.

Yesterday morning an audience breathless with anticipation was treated to something really singular—a column headed "Where Angels Fear," (we can't imagine its frightening any angels, though it was frightful in its own right) by someone supposedly initialed J.S.

There was an accompanying picture of a black smudge of ink wearing a hat looking more like Dick Tracy than anything else. Who knows? Perhaps Mr. Tracy is the actual author—the accompanying literary epic is about what one would expect from that minor giant of the comic pages.

This "Where Angels Fear" is apparently to be a new dodge in the old game of kicking the

Greeks around. Sometimes the Greeks have richly deserved it, and other times the mad geniuses of the press have had to go pretty far afield.

Now, good straightforward criticism by someone not afraid to sign, either by name or by correct initials, their efforts may still be irritating, but it's nothing to the sly insinuations of someone using the fictitious initials "J.S."—which could possibly mean "Jackass, Second class."

It's very difficult to combat the type of column we were treated to yesterday, for it deals in fairly sly generalities and slurs of such a nature that if one objects, he can then be accused of "having a guilty conscience."

But there can be little doubt of the nasty tone of yesterday's masterpiece. Notice for example, the pat on the back for "the present coalition," USA, when the unnamed oracle comments that it (USA) "seems to have gained unity after hearing the erroneous stories which were being circulated about it." Observe what a concrete comment this is not.

Next we read, "The Greek party

met just before the term closed to give a vote of confidence in itself." This doesn't sound as nice, does it. But what's the difference between "seeming to gain unity" and having a "vote of confidence?" Is one better than the other? You'd think so, to read "Where Angels Fear."

We'll cut this short at this point, having already, we fear, descended somewhat to the level of yesterday's writer in an attempt to indicate that not everyone around the Emerald, not to mention the rest of the campus, feels as the timid one does.

The point we'd wish to make is not that the AGS is infallible, nor even that the USA is as bad as the AGS—in our opinion USA probably is set up on somewhat more democratic lines. The point is that there are legitimate criticisms of both, but that in the past we've been treated mainly to the criticisms of the Greeks, both legitimate and otherwise.

Let's hope that if we must be confronted with such insinuating pieces as yesterday's the author will at least come out into the open.

### Colleges From Coast to Coast

## Loyalty Oaths Strongly Approved, Disapproved

Loyalty oaths and academic freedom have not been issues on the Oregon campus, but they've taken up much space in college newspapers across the country in the past two weeks.

Below are a few of the new developments on the college loyalty front.

The Associated Students of the University of Colorado recently put its stamp of approval on the University's action in the loyalty oath, the Board of Regents investigations, and the David Hawkins case.

Last month the regents ruled that all faculty members must take the state teachers loyalty oath and that a committee be set up to investigate reports of subversive persons on campus. It was also ruled that David Hawkins, professor of philosophy, be investigated for charges of disloyalty.

The ASUC resolution said it was "satisfied that the whole affair is being handled satisfactorily by the University."

Meanwhile, the editorial pages of the Silver and Gold, student newspaper, have been filled with letters and editorials concerning the loyalty oath.

In an editorial the Silver and Gold told the following anecdote: "It seems that a member of the University faculty was speaking at a luncheon somewhere in Colorado recently. At the conclusion of his address a gentleman arose and said, 'Sir, I understand that

they teach Communism in the classes at the University. Is that true?'"

"The faculty member replied: 'Sir, that is quite true. We do teach Communism in our classes. And in our medical school we teach syphilis. But we don't advocate either.'"

At the University of California the Academic Senate committee recently slammed the loyalty oath there, as imposed by the board of regents, in a 63-page report.

"Formidable as the evidence is," declared the report, "it is but partly indicative of the wreckage present and prospective."

The "bill of damage" included these items: In addition to the 26 professors fired by the regents, 37 others have resigned in pro-

test. "Only the ignorant will estimate the loss to the University in terms of these numbers," the report said.

The Rambler, St. Benedict's college, Kansas, recently asked in an editorial: "Are American universities providing a haven for Communists? Is it possible that under the most well informed educators of our nation a doctrine is breeding which has for its ultimate goal the destruction of democracy and all they are teaching?"

Three paragraphs later the Rambler answered its own question: "Yes, the commie is in our universities. He is busy even now with his work . . . but this work can be stemmed by a prudent student body, unwilling to fall for his 'divide and conquer' tactics."

### It Could Be Oregon



"I would like a job teaching psychology. This is my wife—need any further recommendations."

### The Second Cup

Headline of the week was submitted to a journalism professor at Kansas State college—"Hydrant Sprays Dog."

At Michigan State College an English instructor was having trouble holding his class' attention. At the same time he kept confusing Jefferson and Franklin. The second time he mixed the two names, he declared, "I think I need some blood in my head." Laying his glasses on the desk, he executed a perfect handstand.